



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,796	12/20/2001	Manfred Schroedl	P21760	8682

7055 7590 03/12/2003

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

LE, DANG D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/926,796	SCHROEDL, MANFRED	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dang D Le	2834	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>1,2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the word "comprising" in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Drawings*

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the following features must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s):

- Claims 29, 32, 35, 81, and 82, "an engine" and "a mechanical aggregate".
- Claims 35 and 36, "a turbo-engine and a turbocharger".
- Claim 37, "the gearbox".
- Claims 38 and 39, "flywheel".
- Claim 40, "a machine's mains".
- Claim 54, "a cooling system" and "a liquid cooling system".

No new matter should be entered. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 40, 55, 61, 62, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 40, 61, 62, and 64, it is not clear what "a machine's mains" is.

Regarding claims 55, it is not clear what "a mains connection" is.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 29-34, 37, 40-48, 50-53, 55, and 78-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seguchi et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,744,895)

Regarding claim 29, Seguchi et al. show an electric motor system, comprising:

- At least a first electric motor comprising a first rotor (1210);
- The first rotor being mechanically coupled to an engine (100);
- At least a second electric motor comprising a second rotor (1310);
- The second rotor being mechanically coupled to a mechanical aggregate (1800); and
- An electronic power system (200, 400, 500, 600, 810, 820),
- Wherein the first electric motor and the second electrical motor are electrically coupled to one another via the electronic power system in order to exchange electric power at a freely selectable voltage level (200, 400).

Regarding claims 30-34, 37, 40-48, 50-53, 55, and 78-80, it is noted that Seguchi et al. also show all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seguchi et al. in view of Atkinson et al.

Regarding claims 35 and 36, Seguchi et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the aggregate comprising at least one of a turbo-engine and a turbocharger.

Atkinson et al. show the aggregate comprising at least one of a turbo-engine and a turbocharger for the purpose of improving efficiency.

Since Seguchi et al. and Atkinson et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in the aggregate with at least one of a turbo-engine and a turbocharger as taught by Atkinson et al. for the purpose discussed above.

9. Claims 38, 39 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seguchi et al. in view of Rao.

Regarding claims 38 and 39, Seguchi et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the first electric motor being at least one of integrated with the engine and integrated with a flywheel of the engine.

Rao shows the electric motor being at least one of integrated with the engine and integrated with a flywheel of the engine for the purpose of improving efficiency.

Since Seguchi et al. and Rao are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to integrate the first electric motor with the engine and integrated with a flywheel of the engine as taught by Rao for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 54, it is noted that Rao also shows all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

10. Claims 49, 56-77, 81 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seguchi et al. in view of Redzic.

Regarding claim 49, Seguchi et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the mutual stator plate system comprising at least one first stator and at least one second stator, the at least one first stator forming part of the first motor and the at least one second stator forming part of the second motor.

Redzic shows the mutual stator plate system (Figure 3) comprising at least one first stator and at least one second stator, the at least one first stator forming part of the first motor and the at least one second stator forming part of the second motor for the purpose of making a motor/generator apparatus.

Since Seguchi et al. and Redzic are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make the mutual stator plate system with at least one first stator and at least one second stator, the at least one first stator forming part of the first motor and the at least one second stator forming part of the second motor as taught by Redzic for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claims 56-77, 81 and 82, it is noted that Seguchi et al. and Redzic also show all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

***Information on How to Contact USPTO***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Application/Control Number: 09/926,796

Page 7

Art Unit: 2834

872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

March 5, 2003

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Smyth Lk".